REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments claims can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-26 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 12-26 stand objected to due to one or more alleged informalities. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-21, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by non-patent literature entitled "Implementing Oracle Workflow" by Derek Mathieson (hereinafter "Mathieson"). Claims 4-6, 15-17, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0002485 (hereinafter "Bisbee"). Claims 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson, in view of Bisbee and in view of alleged admitted prior art. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson, in view of Bisbee, (Bertino et al.), and alleged admitted prior art.

Objections to the Claims

Applicants respectfully traverse the objections to claims 12-26 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections due to alleged informalities.

In regard to claim 12, the Office Action alleges that the phrase "configured to" is passively recited and draws into question if the memory actually stores the computer program or if it merely has the intended use of doing so. While Applicants respectfully disagree Applicants have amended claim 12 to recite that the computer-readable memory is "storing a set of instructions executable by the processor to…". Applicants further respectfully submit that the phrase "computer program to" also fails to raise any issue, however, such objection is moot in view of Applicants clarification of the language. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to claim 12 and those claims dependent directly or indirectly from claim 18.

In regard to claim 19, the Office Action alleges that the terms "code for" are passively recited and bring into question "whether the actions are actually performed." Applicants respectfully disagree because claim 19 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-executable code. In this scenario, the claim language does in fact "limit a claim to a particular structure" because the claimed computer readable storage medium reads on only those storage medium comprising the claimed computer-executable code. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to claim 19 and those claims dependent directly or indirectly from claim 19.

In regard to claim 26, Applicants have corrected the typographically error and amended claim 26 to recited "associated."

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-21, and 25 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Mathieson.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131). Applicants also note that under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Office Action alleges that Mathieson teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-21, and 25. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Mathieson fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-21, and 25.

For example, Mathieson fails to disclose or suggest the feature recited in amended claim 1 of "intercepting transaction data from the database transaction with the computer system prior to the database management system committing the database transaction being committed to the database based on the application event monitored by the computer system that is triggered by the database transaction." The Office Action merely points to a document routing section in

Mathieson which discloses that when "a document is assigned to a user...the document status is updated." However, the Office Action fails to demonstrate that Mathieson updates the status of the document by "intercepting transaction data from the database transaction with the computer system prior to the database management system committing the database transaction being committed to the database based on the application event monitored by the computer system that is triggered by the database transaction" as recited in amended claim 1.

Methieson further fails to disclose the feature of "automatically creating an electronic record at the computer system from the intercepted transaction data prior to the database management system committing the database transaction to the database according to a mapping between the data from underlying database tables associated with the database transaction to the at least some of the one or more fields" as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action points to two figures in Mathieson "which display records of status information of of documents." However, merely displaying information does not satisfy the requirement that "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." The Office Action fails to illustrate that the displayed records are automatically created as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that for at least a similar rationale as discussed above, Mathieson fails to disclose the features recited in amended claim 1 of "receiving, at a computer system hosting a database management system that manages the database, information defining an application event that, upon occurrence, causes the database management system to intercept database transactions instantiated between database applications and the database management system and generate from data identified in the database transaction an electronic record that requires an electronic signature;" "receiving, at the computer system, information defining one or more fields for the data identified in the database transaction to be stored in the electronic record;" and "receiving, at the computer system, information that maps data from underlying database tables associated with the database transaction to at least some of the one or more fields."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Mathison fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit

that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Mathieson, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12, 19, and 26 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-11, 13-18, and 20-25 that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 12, and 19 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 4-6, 8, 15-17, 22-24, and 26 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Mathieson, in view of Bisbee, Bertino, and any alleged admitted prior art.

OID-2003-317-01

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62065560 v1

OID-2003-317-01